APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,486	03/11/2005	Olaf Joeressen	915-006.073	7159

4955   7590   11/27/2007
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER
LEWIS, ALICIA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _10 September 2007_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-3,6-13 and 15_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-3,6-13 and 15_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

    1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to the Request for Continued Examination filed

September 10, 2007. Claims 1-3, and 15 have been amended, and claims 4, 5, 14 and

16 are canceled. Claims 1-3, 6-13 and 15 remain pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-3, 6-13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Will (US Patent 6,392,640) in view of Dostie et al. (US Patent

Application Publication 2004/0021691 A1) ('Dostie').

With respect to claims 1 and 11-13 and 15, Will teaches:

generating, for browsing, a character subset of said character set, said character

subset including words, according to an inference logic, that are consistent with the

sequence of letters entered (column 6 lines 54-58);

displaying said character subset on a display of said electronic device, for

browsing and selecting the word by the user (column 6 lines 54 – column 7 line 3),

wherein said inference logic is based on a database of words and at least one

usage parameter related to each of said words, wherein said usage parameter is stored

in said database (Figure 13B, column 13 lines 46-66), and.

wherein said user interface is a roller, and wherein browse commands are issued

by rotating the roller around its axis, and wherein select commands are issued by

pressing the roller (column 2 lines 27-33).

Will does not teach said character subset including characters from among

which, according to inference logic, **the next character** for said word is most probably

selected, displaying said character subset for browsing and selecting **the next**

character, or adapting contents of a database by adding a new word to the database

after at least one word has been entered.

Dostie teaches a method, system and media for entering data in a personal

computing device (see abstract), in which he teaches: generating, for browsing a

character subset of said character set, said character subset including characters from

among which, according to inference logic, the next character for said word is most

probably selected (paragraphs 102-103),

displaying said character subset for browsing and selecting the next character

(Figures 3 and 29, paragraphs 102-103), and

adapting contents of a database by adding a new word to the database after at

least one word has been entered (paragraph 214).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to have modified Will by the teaching of Dostie because said

character subset including characters from among which, according to inference logic, **the next character** for said word is most probably selected, displaying said character subset for browsing and selecting **the next character**, or adapting contents of a database by adding a new word to the database after at least one word has been entered would enable the database or dictionary to have learning capabilities, thus providing more functionality (Dostie, paragraph 214).

With respect to claim 2, Will as modified teaches wherein said at least one usage parameter for a certain word is related to the individual number of occurrences of usage of said certain word (Will, column 13 lines 46-58).

With respect to claim 3, Will as modified teaches wherein said at least one usage parameter for a certain word is related to the individual number of occurrence of usages of said certain word and the total number of occurrence of words (Will, column 13 lines 46-61).

With respect to claim 6, Will as modified teaches further comprising storing said selected characters in a log file for determining new usage parameters, and wherein said inference logic determines said subset of most probable characters by evaluating said log file (Dostie, paragraphs 79 and 203).

With respect to claim 7, Will as modified teaches wherein words stored in said database of words are arranged in the form of a tree such that a root of the tree consists of a beginning of a word, the root being connected to nodes representing single characters on a next level such that on each level, potential characters are, in order of probability, connected to a node on a pervious level whereby, as the process proceeds from the root of the tree through the nodes to a node on the last level, the characters in the nodes combine to form a word in said database of words (Dostie, Figure 4, paragraphs 88-90).

With respect to claim 8, Will as modified teaches wherein, the character subset is interlinked with the character set, in order to browse the characters on the display, such that upon browsing past the character subset, the browsing of the character set begins (Will, Figure 1B, column 6 lines 24-45; Dostie, Figures 3 and 29, paragraph 103).

With respect to claim 9, Will as modified teaches wherein generating the character subset with said inference logic comprises:

identifying a start of an entry of a new word (Dostie, paragraphs 9 and 79),

inserting, into the character subset, the most probable letters stored in the database of words for starting a word (Dostie, paragraphs 9 and 82).

With respect to claim 10, Will as modified teaches:

identifying a text being entered, wherein the characters of said text relating to a

word are entered (Dostie, paragraph 79),

identifying words being stored in said database of words that are appropriate for

the word being entered (Dostie, paragraph 82), and

selecting, for the character subset, a character from each appropriate probable

entry to be the possibly entered text (Dostie, paragraph 104).

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 6-13 and 15 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Alicia M. Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-

5599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9 - 6:30, alternate

Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on 571-272-4085. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alicia Lewis
November 21, 2007

**SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER**